

REMARKS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for his examination of the present application, and for extending a personal interview to Applicants' representative Charles Duan. By way of summary, Claims 37-68 were pending in the present application. By this amendment, Applicants have cancelled Claims 37-55 without prejudice or disclaimer, amended Claims 56, and 63, and added new Claims 69-101. Accordingly, Claims 56-99 remain pending for consideration.

The Office Action rejected Claims 37-68 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103. In response, Applicants have amended the claims. For at least the reasons discussed at the interview and provided below, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, overcome the pending rejections.

As discussed during the interview, it would be greatly appreciated if the Examiner would contact Applicants' representative to discuss any additional issues that may arise following this amendment, such as if additional relevant references are identified.

Rejection of Claims 37-40, 43-56, 59, 61-63, 65, and 67-68 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 37-40, 43-56, 59, 61-63, 65, and 67-68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 6,064,674 to Doidge et al. ("Doidge") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,708,780 to Levergood et al. ("Levergood"). For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Doidge and Levergood, alone or in combination with other art of record, do not teach or render obvious all the limitations of the claims.

Regarding Claims 37-40, and 43-55, Applicants have cancelled these claims without prejudice or disclaimer in order to advance prosecution, but reserve the right to revisit these claims at a later time.

Regarding **Claim 56**, the cited prior art of Doidge and Levergood do not teach or render obvious at least "sending, to the portable communication device, a modified browser redirect message based upon the browser redirect message, the modified browser redirect message configured to indicate that it was sent by the network resource," as required by the claim. Doidge "relates to local area network switching

apparatuses for routing and bridging data transfers," *col. 1 ll. 7-8*, but it does not teach browser redirection messages. Accordingly, the Office Action relied on Levergood to teach this limitation. *Office Action* at 4-5.

Levergood teaches "methods of processing service requests from a client to a server through a network," *col. 3 ll. 7-8*. Levergood teaches that "the user causes the browser to generate a URL GET request 100 at FIG. 2A. The browser forwards the request to a content server 120, which processes the request." *Col. 5 ll. 32-35*. Then, "the content server sends a 'REDIRECT' response 122 to the browser 100 to redirect the user's initial request to an authentication server." *Col. 5 ll. 46-49*. However, Levergood does not teach or render obvious at least "sending, to the portable communication device, a modified browser redirect message based upon the browser redirect message, the modified browser redirect message configured to indicate that it was sent by the network resource," as required by the claim.

Furthermore, as discussed during the interview, Doidge teaches away from combination with references such as Levergood, because Doidge teaches, for example, that an object of the invention is "to convert formats between different layer 2 protocols using special purpose hardware ***without the aid of a microprocessor***," *col. 5 ll. 52-54*, and combining the teachings of Levergood into Doidge would contradict that object of the invention and frustrate the purpose of Doidge.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Doidge and Levergood, alone or in combination with other art of record, do not teach or render obvious all the limitations of Claim 56. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 63 is believed to be patentable at least for reasons analogous to those stated above with respect to Claim 56, as Doidge and Levergood do not teach or render obvious at least "sending, to the portable communication device, a modified browser redirect message based upon the browser redirect message, the modified browser redirect message indicating it originated from the network resource," as required by the claim.

Claims 59, 61-62, 65, and 67-68, which depend from one of Claims 56, and 63, are believed to be patentable for the reasons provided above with respect to the independent claims, and by reason of the additional features recited in each dependent claim.

Rejection of Claims 57-58, 60, 64, and 66 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 41-42 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer for purposes of advancing prosecution. Applicants reserve the right to revisit these claims at a later time. Claims 57-58, 60, 64, and 66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 6,064,674 to Doidge et al. ("Doidge") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,708,780 to Levergood et al. ("Levergood") and U.S. Pat. No. 6,253,327 to Zhang et al. ("Zhang"). Each of the claims depends from one of Claims 37, 40, 56, and 63, and thus they are believed to be patentable for the reasons provided above with respect to the independent claims, and by reason of the additional features recited in each dependent claim.

New Claims

New Claims 69-101 have been added to more fully define the Applicant's invention and are believed to be fully distinguished over the prior art of record.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims overcome the rejections of record. If any further issues are identified or additional relevant references are located, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' representative at the number listed below.

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, Applicant is not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. Applicant reserves the right to

Application No.: 09/458602
Filing Date: December 8, 1999

pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicant has made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: May 19, 2011

By: /Jarom Kesler/

Jarom D. Kesler
Registration No. 57,046
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20995
(949) 760-0404

11260604